UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

IN RE: Case No. 08-35653 (KRH)

Chapter 11

Jointly Administered

CIRCUIT CITY STORES,

INC., et al.,

701 East Broad Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Debtors.

June 25, 2013

2:04 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING BEFORE HONORABLE KEVIN R. HUENNEKENS UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Tavenner & Beran, PLC

By: LYNN S. TAVENNER, ESQ.

20 North Eighth Street, 2nd Floor

Richmond, VA 23219

For Sony Electronics,

Inc.:

Kutak Rock, LLP

By: PETER J. BARRETT, ESO.

Bank of America Center

1111 East Main Street, Suite 800

Richmond, VA 23219

Loan Funding, LLC:

For Credit Suisse Blankingship & Keith, PC By: JEREMY BRIAN ROOT, ESQ.

4020 University Drive, Suite 300

Fairfax, VA 22030

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service

> J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

By: ANDREW W. CAINE, ESQ. 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard

Los Angeles, CA 90067

For Credit Suisse Cohen Tauber Spievack & Wagner, LLP

Loan Funding, LLC: By: LEO L. ESSES, ESQ.

420 Lexington Avenue, Suite 2400

2

New York, NY 10170

- - -

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

All right. Thank you, Mr. Esses.

MS. TAVENNER: Your Honor, as brief background, I'm

24

25

THE COURT:

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sure you're well aware of the amended complaint that's been 2 filed in this matter. It seeks a large preference claim against the defendant Sony Electronics and, in addition to that, there are other issues related to a 503(b)(9) claim, 5 proofs of claim, receivables, a multitude of legal issues in which we have been working diligently, all sides, Your Honor, to try and mediate the matter. We appreciate Your Honor's assistance in allowing us to utilize judicial mediator, Judge Santoro.

We have had two meetings with Judge Santoro to date and despite the efforts of the parties prior to the last meeting, I think, Your Honor, we were all going like this. Judge Santoro has recognized that and has put together a protocol for all the parties and identified certain specific baby steps, if you will, to assist the parties in at least at the end of the day coming together in the middle to recognize specifically what the real facts are and what the legal issues are.

We're hopeful at the end of that day that we can -once we can come to terms on that, that we can reach a resolution. In the event that we don't, we believe that we will be in a much better position to be able to efficiently litigate the matter before Your Honor.

When we were before Judge Santoro and we discussed 25∥ the next steps and the procedural mechanism that he put in

place, the parties also discussed the need for a protective order in conjunction with the same, because we --

2

3

4

9

11

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

That's what triggered my inquiry. THE COURT:

MS. TAVENNER: Yes. And we recognized that -- and 5 Judge Santoro has suggested that in order -- because the stakes 6 are so high in this matter, the amounts at issue, in order to most effectively take advantage of the mediation process, we need to be able to come to the table and present all facts and, if you will, leave the litigation tactics outside the door 10 before we come in.

And, because of that, the parties have agreed to a 12∥procedure that Judge Santoro has suggested but certainly we're hopeful that Your Honor would recognize the need for a protective order, given that we are baring our souls in this mediation. And I'm happy for --

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Tavenner, my problem was not so much with the protective order. As you well know, I have entered protective orders --

MS. TAVENNER: Sure.

THE COURT: -- on numerous occasions and the form of the protective order did not bother me at all. What bothered me and what shocked me actually, quite frankly, when I got the motion for the entry of the protective order, was that this case was filed in November of 2010, all right, we are -pursuant to procedures that I established at the beginning of

4

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19 II

20 l

21

22

23

24

25

1 this case which required all of these types of cases, avoidance $2 \parallel$ actions, to be mediated and we went through a mediation in this case.

And in connection with that particular mediation, I 5 entered four separate orders extending the time within which 6 the debtors -- the debtor and the defendant could extend the mediation in the hope of getting it resolved. And there were many plaintiff requests to extend the time and that we're getting close and all the rest of it and then of course it fell apart.

And then the parties came back to me and that was basically in the fall of last year and said, please, we would like to do a judicial mediation. And I said, will that really help? And you said, yes, it would. Mr. Barrett said, yes, it would. I said, okay. And you asked specifically for Judge Santoro. I prevailed upon him and got him to agree to conduct a mediation.

Once again, the same pattern occurs where I get orders that are being submitted, asking me to extend the time after I've entered my mediation protocol order to extend the mediation period so the parties might be able to further discuss and go on. And, again, by my count I've now entered five of those orders and we were coming up on June 30th when the time was going to expire.

And that's when I got this motion for a protective

7

9

10

11

12

14

16

19

20

21

22

order. And I'm trying to figure out in my way how in the world 2 we're going to resolve this mediation by June 30th, given the 3 fact that for some reason that was beyond my ken, the parties 4 were now for the first time trying to exchange some critical 5 documents.

I would have thought that that would have been done back in the first mediation back when we were trying to do all of the other stuff. And here we are, three years into the case, and we haven't even exchanged some documents that are apparently pivotal to the parties being able to reconcile their differences. And I'm just getting to think what in the world is going on, all right? And I'm going to give Mr. Barrett a 13 chance at the podium, too.

But -- and then, after I'd noticed this hearing because I wanted to know how in the world we're going to finish by June 30, I've now got a request on my desk to continue this mediation out to next February. I could try this case ten times between now and February. And so, I'm not pleased with where we are, the progress that is, quote, not being made. shouldn't be taking baby steps. We should be taking giant steps. And I don't understand why we are where we are.

I know one thing and that is that Judge Santoro doesn't need any help getting -- knocking heads together and things of that sort. But, obviously, people aren't listening to him. At least that's my impression and so that -- and my

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20 l

21

22

25

And I'm trying to figure out why I should not set 2 this case down for trial right away and just get on with it and move on.

MS. TAVENNER: Well, Your Honor, I can appreciate 5 that, given the time that has elapsed. I am hopeful that you 6 can also appreciate that we do not take Judge Santoro lightly and are working very hard to abide by everything that he is -has put into place and it is, at this point, demands of him. And we specifically discussed with him the protective order that's before you and shared it with him prior to even submitting it to you. And he was on board with the process that has been put into place.

THE COURT: Is he the one that wants this mediation scheduled out until February of next year?

MS. TAVENNER: I don't -- we did not specifically discuss with Judge Santoro the extension time. We did, though, in -- the last time that he was here a few weeks ago discuss certain benchmarks of information to be shared amongst each other. Each side has different time periods to do things. And with that time line that he set up, it necessarily would put us out into those dates.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Barrett.

23 MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Your Honor. Peter Barrett 24 on behalf of Sony Electronics, Inc.

Your Honor, we'd echo much of what Ms. Tavenner said

as far as the summary of where the case goes --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16 l

19

20

21

22

23

THE COURT: Since she just took the brunt of my spieling.

> MR. BARRETT: And I certainly appreciate that. (Laughter)

I will offer just a little bit of MR. BARRETT: explanation. I don't know that the protective order was something that any of counsel was advocating for very strongly.

THE COURT: I could care less about the protective order. I want to know why documents have not been exchanged until this point and why we're just now getting around to doing 12 some discovery that should have been done eons ago.

MR. BARRETT: Your Honor, documents have been exchanged. Documents were -- I mean, as far back as six months before they filed the lawsuit against us, Skadden Arps and our firm were exchanging information about reconciliation of certain claims. Since the trust took over and Ms. Tavenner and 18∥Ms. Beran, there's been document exchange back and forth. They've provided a CD-ROM full of documents supporting certain parts of their case. Our business people have been in contact with one another. So I don't want the Court to be under the misimpression that there has not been any exchange.

The mediator had suggested to us that his protocol was going to be based on a concept of full transparency and, like Ms. Tavenner said, sort of leaving the litigation at the door and coming in, open kimono and --

THE COURT: Why wouldn't that have been done back in the first mediation?

MR. BARRETT: Well, I mean, the first -- there was some. I think that the, you know, the discussion now is that there needs to be more and there needs to be a lot more.

THE COURT: How open? I mean, coming in, I would expect that that would be how you would do a mediation. I mean, why is anybody hiding the ball at this point?

MR. BARRETT: I don't know that people are hiding the ball, but we are far -- I mean, it's a complicated case, even though preference cases are not terribly complicated.

This case involves \$191 million of preference, so that's that piece. Then, \$71 million of accounts receivable, which is incredibly complicated because accounts receivable encompasses scores of programs. And then, another, you know --millions, tens of millions in claim objection to both the general unsecured claim and the 503(b)(9) claim. So there are a number of factual and legal issues. So I don't think anybody's hiding the ball but I do think -- and now we have from Judge Santoro a very clear protocol with a specified set of deadlines, timetables.

And the reason why we go so far -- and I think that date may have come up just between counsel. I don't know that Judge Santoro said, you know, it needs to go to 2014. But we

do have homework assignments or deliverables that go all the $2 \parallel$ way through the -- towards the end of October of this year. 3 I think the idea, at least in my mind, was with deliverables 4 occurring that late and with the normal sort of, you know, lag 5 time, that we probably would need until the beginning of next 6 year in order to, you know, hopefully come to a resolution in this case or at least narrow the issues for trial.

THE COURT: Are you lead counsel in this case?

MR. BARRETT: Yes.

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

19

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: You're going to be trying it when we set it for trial? I'm not very confident this is going to actually settle in mediation. I guess given how many times I've set this out and everything, that's why I inquire.

MR. BARRETT: Yes, Your Honor. Sony has no other counsel than our firm.

THE COURT: Is Judge Santoro -- well, Ms. Tavenner said he's not the one that's asking for February of '14 but 18 he's given you assignments out to October?

MR. BARRETT: Yes, Your Honor. Our last assignment 20∥ is due on October 17th, is when we have to send something out the door. We have a simultaneous exchange of certain information, so February (sic) 18th would really be the day that we have the exchange.

THE COURT: Are your financial consultants talking 25 with their financial consultant?

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BARRETT: Yes, our businesspeople -- the trust 2 has businesspeople that are employed, and Sony has people in its credits department that are employed by Sony that are in contact -- I don't know how recent the contact is, but they have been previously and they seem to communicate, you know, as pleasantly as possible in a quarter of a billion dollar lawsuit.

THE COURT: Is Judge Santoro satisfied with the pace that this case is going?

MR. BARRETT: I'd hate to put words in his mouth. don't think anybody's satisfied with the pace that it's going. I think --

THE COURT: I know at least one person who's not.

MR. BARRETT: And I understand that. And, Your Honor, I don't think either one of our clients is particularly pleased with the pace that it's going but I think Judge Santoro is satisfied that he's put a strong fulsome protocol out there to do his best to bring the parties together. And I think, and I feel comfortable putting these words in his mouth, that if this protocol doesn't work to either bring the parties together or significantly narrow the issues for trial, then nothing will.

THE COURT: I'm assuming that if the mediation breaks down and we don't get it done, we're not going to have a long period of any kind of discovery, that all of that is going to

1 already have been accomplished?

2

6

7

8

9

12

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

MR. BARRETT: That's the idea. I mean, there are 3 still certain things to be ironed out but that -- yes, that is 4 the idea, that much of this information exchange is not going 5 to have to be -- you know, we're not going to have to reinvent the wheel through a formal discovery process down the road.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Root, did you wish to be heard?

MR. ROOT: No, Your Honor. I think Mr. Esses is 10 more involved in the mediation and is probably more likely to 11 have something to say.

THE COURT: All right. Is your firm providing some 13∥ sort of credit or support or what is Credit Suisse's involvement in the case?

MR. ESSES: Your Honor, it's Mr. Esses. May I 16 address that?

THE COURT: Yes, you may, Mr. Esses. And I apologize. I just thought Mr. Root was in the courtroom and I 19 know him.

MR. ESSES: No problem. I mean, Credit Suisse is involved in this tangentially to the extent it is holding certain claims that Sony had with Circuit City. So, to the extent that there are any effect of those claims with regards to Sony and Circuit City, Credit Suisse is here to address those issues now, as opposed to having to come in later and

1 have to worry about it later. We -- instead, we have real time $2 \parallel$ as to what's going on. But we have no underlying facts or 3 information regarding that. So we're taking a seat and $4 \parallel$ providing whatever information the parties ask of us.

THE COURT: Are you actively involved in 6 participating in the mediation?

5

7

9

10

11

12 **|**

13

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ESSES: I have personally been involved in the first two mediations, the third one with permission of Judge Santoro and the parties. I did not fly down -- I'm in New York City. I did not fly down to Virginia for that one. It is really, you know, facts that have been exchanged between Circuit City and Sony at this point.

THE COURT: All right, very good. Ms. Tavenner, 14 you're going to be trying the case on behalf of Circuit City? MS. TAVENNER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to enter the protocol -- or the protective order so that the parties can exchange the information. I expect that the information that's going to be exchanged is going to be completely forthcoming and that we're not going to have any hold backs or anything else, that we're going to get to the bottom line.

I expect everyone to speed up the pace. When Ms. Tavenner says certain baby steps, I expect everybody to start walking broadly at this point and to get to the conclusion of this thing. I am not going to extend this mediation protocol

out to February. I'm going to extend it to November 30, which 2 gives you 30 days after the October homework assignment that 3 Mr. Barrett told me about.

If there is some reason why this mediation can't be 5 completed within that time period, then I would strongly 6 recommend -- we will have another hearing where you can request that -- but I would strongly recommend that Judge Santoro call 8 me and ask for it specifically, because otherwise I'm going to be disinclined to extend anything further, and you could expect a trial well before your February 14 day.

Any questions regarding the Court's concerns in 12 connection with this adversary proceeding?

MS. TAVENNER: No, Your Honor.

4

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Does any counsel have any questions?

(No audible response)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you all for being here today.

18 UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you.

> Thank you, Your Honor. MR. ESSES:

THE COURT: You may be excused, Mr. Esses.

MS. TAVENNER: I don't see anybody else running up to the lectern so may I continue, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may continue, Ms. Tavenner.

MS. TAVENNER: The second item on today's agenda is the objection to Claim Number 14787 filed by Chase Bank. Your

4

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Honor, the parties are in active discussions to resolve this $2 \parallel$ and would like to continue the status hearing until August the 27th at 10 a.m.

THE COURT: All right. It'll be continued to August 5 27.

MS. TAVENNER: Thank you, Your Honor. Item 3 is the motion to reconsider filed by G&S Livingston Realty, Inc. Your Honor will recall that Mr. Vogel was here last time and we advised you that we were in the midst of settlement discussions and asked for one additional continuance in the hopes that it would be resolved. I'm happy to report that it has indeed been resolved.

THE COURT: All right. That's excellent news, okay. So I can take that off the docket?

MS. TAVENNER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, super.

MS. TAVENNER: That leaves Item 4 which is the liquidating trust's motion for order striking Docket Number We also discussed this matter at the last hearing, Your Honor. It involved a claim filed by Johannes F. de Wolf. told you that I had been in personal contact with him by telephone and we have continued to be in contact with him by phone.

At this point, the trust is prepared to withdraw its motion that's before Your Honor and we will proceed under the

1∥ mediation protocol that Your Honor has put into place 2 previously with respect to PI claimants. THE COURT: All right, very good. All right. 3 MS. TAVENNER: Then, that concludes the matter --4 5 THE COURT: That concludes our docket. Is there any 6 other matter that's not on the docket that we need to take up in the Circuit City matter today? 8 MS. TAVENNER: Not today, Your Honor, thank you. 9 THE COURT: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, 10 Mr. Caine. 11 MR. CAINE: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 13 <u>CERTIFICATION</u> I, STEPHANIE SCHMITTER, court approved transcriber, 14 15 certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the 16 official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and to the best of my ability. 18 19 /s/ Stephanie Schmitter 20 STEPHANIE SCHMITTER 21 J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: July 8, 2013 22 23 24

25